

United States Patent and Trademark Office

On

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/507,128	09/10/2004	Patrizia Melpignano	APV31817	8838	
24257 7590 01/16/2007 STEVENS DAVIS MILLER & MOSHER, LLP 1615 L STREET, NW			EXAMINER		
			REHM, ADAM C		
SUITE 850 WASHINGTO	N. DC 20036		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
Whomiston, 20 2000			2875		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Applicant(s)	
MELPIGNANO ET AL.	

	Adam C. Rehm	2875	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 18 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or a statutory period for reply expire I.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the appropria	to ovtonsion foo
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	oliance with 37 CEP 41 37 must be	filed within two month	se of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo 	nsideration and/or search (see NO` w);	TE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or			the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed. 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro-		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	indea below of appended.		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			
	<i>></i>	PRIMARY EXAMIN	O NER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant asserts the following:

- 1. Applicant appears to argue that because the lenses of BRASS is moveable and/or used to focus on a target area, the MADIGAN-BRASS combination does not read on the claimed invention. However, BRASS is only employed to evidence the obviousness of providing a light source with its optical axis laterally shifted from the central axis of a lens in order to manipulate and direct light as desired. Whether the BRASS lens is moveable and the precise purpose of the lens is not irrelevant.
- 2. Applicant argues that MADIGAN and BRASS involve different technological fields and are therefore not analgous art. However, Examiner notes that both references deal directly with Class 362: Illumination. As such, Examiner respectfully disagrees.
- 3. Applicant argues size variations between the claimed invention and BRASS are different. Examiner notes that BRASS is not utilized to demonstrate the obviousness of size, but is instead utilized to demonstrate the obviousness of providing a light source with its optical axis laterally shifted from the central axis of a lens in order to manipulate and direct light as desired.
- 4. Applicant asserts that the fundamental combination of MADIGAN and BRASS is flawed. Examiner respectfully disagrees since BRASS clearly teaches the deficiency of MADIGAN, i.e. the laterally shifting of the lens to manipulate light as desired.
- 5. Applicant presents a number of arguments in regard to Claims 6, 7, 22 and 23. Since the claims depend from Claim 1, they are rejected by the references applied to claim 1, i.e. MADIGAN and BRASS. Applicant argues that the values of the claimed invention are significantly lower than measurements of MADIGAN and that reducing the size of a microlens requires reducing the size of a light source (OLED diameter). Examiner respectfully submits that this concept is notoriously known in the art. Not only are changes of size, i.e. mere scaling up [down] or a prior art process well within the skill level of one having ordinary skill in the art, but discovering the optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215.
- 6. Applicant argues that the method claims should be afforded patentable weight. However, Examiner notes that the device formed by these method claims is rejected by MADIGAN and BRASS.